REMARKS

Claims 1–11, 19–25, 30, 32–38, 40–41 and 49 are pending in this application. In the August 11, 2003 Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1–11, 15, 17, 19–26, 30, 32–41 and 46–49. In particular, the Examiner rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,412 ("the Sockut patent"). The Examiner further rejected Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sockut in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,460,048 ("the Teng patent"). The Examiner further rejected Claims 1–2, 4, 8–11, 19, 21–22, 24–25, 32, 34–35 and 37–38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,640 ("the Pereira patent") in view of Teng.

The Examiner further rejected Claims 15 and 46–47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,297,279 ("the Bannon patent") in view of Pereira. The Examiner further rejected Claims 3, 20, 23, 30, 33, 36, 40 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng and Sockut. The Examiner further rejected Claims 26 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng and U.S. Patent No. 6,343,296 ("the Lakhamraju patent"). The Examiner further rejected Claims 5–7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng, Lakhamraju and U.S. Patent No. 6,016,497 ("the Suver patent").

By this amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claims 15–16, 26, 39 and 46–48 and have amended Claims 1 and 40. In view of the following comments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

PRIORITY

Applicants note that the Final Office Action Cover Sheet did not indicate acknowledgement of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) as indicated on Page 1, paragraph 1 of the specification. Applicants respectfully request an acknowledgement in any subsequent Office Action.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Amended Claim 1 and Claims 2, 4 and 8–11

The Examiner rejected Claims 1–2, 4 and 8–11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng.

Focusing on amended independent Claim 1, in one embodiment of Applicants' invention a method is disclosed for reorganizing a table in a database. The method comprises, among other things, (1) reorganizing data of an original table by copying the data to a reorganized table and (2) applying a trigger lock to the reorganized table. The trigger lock blocks select data modification operations against the reorganized table while allowing other operations against the reorganized table. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to further emphasize that the trigger lock allows some operations against the table during the reorganization process.

Neither Pereira nor Teng teach applying a trigger lock to a reorganized table that blocks some data modification operations while allowing other operations against the reorganized table during reorganization. The Examiner acknowledged in the August 11, 2003 Final Office Action that Pereira does not teach applying a trigger lock to the reorganized table (see page 6). However, the Examiner stated that Teng does teach "the locking of a reorganization table (col. 2 lines 19–24)."

The portion of the Teng reference cited by the Examiner states that "[d]uring the SWITCH phase, any access requests to the database objects involved in the reorganization are queued until the SWITCH phase is complete." In addition, Teng describes the database as being offline during the SWITCH (see col. 2, lines 28–34). Thus, Teng appears to delay all operations during reorganization so that there is no access to the database. Only after the reorganization, is access allowed to the database files (see col. 2, lines 49–51). Teng does not teach blocking some data modification operations while allowing other operations access to the reorganized object during reorganization.

Because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest a system or a method wherein a trigger lock is applied to a reorganized table so as to block some operations while allowing others during reorganization, Applicants assert that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Pereira and Teng. Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 1.

Claims 2, 4 and 8–11 depend from amended independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 5–7

The Examiner rejected Claims 5–7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng, Lakhamraju and Suver.

Claims 5–7 depend from independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for the for the reasons set forth with respect to amended Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 19, 21, 22, 24–25, 32, 34–35 and 37–38

The Examiner rejected Claims 19, 21, 22, 24–25, 32, 34–35 and 37–38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng. For the reasons set forth hereafter, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Focusing in particular on independent Claim 22, in one embodiment of Applicants' invention a method for reorganizing an object in a database file is disclosed. The method comprises (1) reorganizing an object by copying data from the object to a reorganized object and (2) applying a trigger lock to the reorganized object. The trigger lock blocks data modification operations from modifying the reorganized object while allowing other operations to access the reorganized object.

Neither Pereira nor Teng teach applying a trigger lock to a reorganized object that blocks some data modification operations while allowing other operations to access the reorganized object. The Examiner acknowledged in the August 11, 2003 Final Office Action that Pereira does not teach applying a trigger lock to the reorganized object (see page 9). However, the Examiner stated that Teng does teach "the locking of a reorganization table (col. 2 lines 19–24)."

The portion of the Teng reference cited by the Examiner states that "[d]uring the SWITCH phase, any access requests to the database objects involved in the reorganization are queued until the SWITCH phase is complete." In addition, Teng describes the database as being offline during the SWITCH (see col. 2, lines 28–34). Thus, Teng appears to delay all operations during reorganization so that there is no access to the database (the Examiner acknowledges on page 19 of the Final Office

Action that no access is allowed to the reorganization table). Teng does not teach blocking some data modification operations while allowing other operations access to the reorganized object.

Because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest a system or a method wherein a trigger lock is applied to a reorganized object so as to block some operations while allowing others, Applicants assert that Claim 22 is not obvious in view of Pereira and Teng. Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 22.

Independent Claims 19, 32 and 35 are believed to be patentable for the different aspects recited therein.

Claim 21 depends from independent Claim 19 and is believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 24–25 depend from independent Claim 22 and are believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 34 depends from independent Claim 32 and is believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 37–38 depend from independent Claim 35 and are believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 3, 20, 23, 30, 33, 36, 40 and 49

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 20, 23, 30, 33, 36, 40 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pereira in view of Teng and Sockut.

Claim 3 depends from amended independent Claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth with respect to amended Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 20 depends from independent Claim 19 and is believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 23 depends from independent Claim 22 and is believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Independent Claim 30 is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set forth with respect to independent Claim 22 and for the different aspects recited therein.

Claim 33 depends from independent Claim 32 and is believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 36 depends from independent Claim 35 and is believed to be patentable for the additional features recited therein.

Independent Claim 40 has been amended to further clarify that, while read-only access is allowed, some access is blocked during the substitution of the reorganized object for the original object . Thus, amended Independent Claim 40 is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set forth with respect to independent Claim 22 and for the different aspects recited therein.

REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 713.01, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants' undersigned attorney of record hereby formally requests a telephone interview with the Examiner as soon as the Examiner has considered the effect of the arguments presented above. Applicants' attorney can be reached at (949) 721-2998 or at the number listed below.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 12/10/03

By: John R. King

John R. King
Registration No. 34,362
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

AMEND
H:\DOCS\CAF\CAF-2215.DOC
121003